

Comments on "Which is the Quantum Decay Law of Relativistic Particles?"

K. Urbanowski*

University of Zielona Góra, Institute of Physics,
ul. Prof. Z. Szafrana 4a, 65–516 Zielona Góra, Poland.

July 7, 2015

Abstract

Results presented in a recent paper "*Which is the Quantum Decay Law of Relativistic particles?*", arXiv: 1412.3346v2 [quant-ph], are analyzed. We show that approximations used therein to derive the main final formula for the survival probability of finding a moving unstable particle to be undecayed at time t force this particle to almost stop moving, that is that, in fact, the derived formula is approximately valid only for $\gamma \cong 1$, where $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{1 - \beta^2}$ and $\beta = v/c$, or in other words, for the velocity $v \simeq 0$.

PACS: 03.65.-w Quantum Mechanics

PACS: 03.30.+p Special Relativity

PACS: 11.10.St Bound and Unstable States; Bethe-Salpeter Equations

In a recent paper [1] authors analyze the relation between the quantum mechanical survival probability of the moving unstable particle and that of the particle at rest. Based on the results of this analysis

*e-mail: K.Urbanowski@proton.if.uz.zgora.pl

they call in question conclusions and results presented in [2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. In these papers it has been shown that rigorous quantum mechanical treatment of the problem leads to the conclusion that in the case of quantum decay processes the standard, classical time dilation formula for the survival probabilities and the standard relation between the decay lifetime of the moving relativistic particle and the particle in the rest work in good approximation for times no longer than a few lifetimes (which is in full agreement with the known experimental results). It is also shown therein that for times much longer than a few lifetimes it may not work.

In [6] the decay curves of the moving relativistic unstable particles has been presented. They were found numerically for particles modeled by Breit–Wigner mass distribution starting from the instant of the creation of the particle up to 100 lifetimes and even 1000 lifetimes depending on the parameters of the model considered. These results confirm the analytical result presented in [2, 3, 4, 5] and discussed also in [6].

Note that, the classical time dilation relation has been verified in many experiments as it was also stated in [1], but in all known experiments this relation was verified for times of order of the lifetime, and generally for times no longer than a few lifetimes [7, 8]. There is not any experimental confirmation of this relation for times longer than a few lifetimes and for much longer times, e.g. for times when the late time deviations of the decay law from the exponential form begin to dominate. So, taking into account these facts one can not state that the conclusion drawn in [2, 3, 4, 5, 6] that the classical dilation formula sufficiently well reflects experimental data only for times no longer than a few lifetimes, is in conflict with results of the experiments mentioned.

There are some statements in [1] which are not obvious, but this does not affect the calculations performed therein. So, let us pass to the analysis of the calculations leading to the final conclusion of [1].

One of the main differences between approach used in [1] and that used in [2, 3, 4, 5, 6] is that within the quantum mechanical treatment of the problem authors of [1] consider the probability amplitude of the survival probability assuming that moving particles have a definite velocity $\vec{v}$ whereas authors of [2, 3, 4, 5, 6] assume that the momentum $\vec{p}$ of the particles considered is definite. The assumption that the momentum is definite allows one to avoid inconsistencies caused by the assumption that the velocity is definite (see, eg. (19), (20) in [1] or

discussion presented in [9, 10]). Moreover, such an assumption is based on the first principles: According to the fundamental principles of the classical physics and quantum theory (including relativistic quantum field theory) the energy and momentum of the moving particle have to be conserved. These conservation laws are one of the basic and model independent tools of the study of reactions between the colliding or decaying particles. There is no an analogous conservation law for the velocity $\vec{v}$. Therefore it seems to be more reasonable to assume that momentum $\vec{p}$ of the moving unstable particles measured in the rest frame of the observer is definite and constant.

In [2, 3, 4, 5, 6] the case of the moving particle observed in the rest frame of the observer is analyzed: In such a case states $|\Phi_p\rangle$, (where $|\Phi_p\rangle$ is the the state vector of the moving unstable particle with the definite momentum $\vec{p}$, which is measured by the observer in his rest reference frame), and $|\Phi_0\rangle \equiv |\Phi_{p=0}\rangle$, are different states belonging to the same Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_0$ connected with the rest frame of the observer. The corresponding survival probabilities are defined as follows: $P_0(t) = |A_0(t)|^2$ and $P_p(t) = |A_p(t)|^2$, where

$$A_0(t) = \langle \Phi_0 | e^{-itH} | \Phi_0 \rangle, \quad (1)$$

$$A_p(t) = \langle \Phi_p | e^{-itH} | \Phi_p \rangle, \quad (2)$$

and H is the total selfadjoint Hamiltonian of the system considered. (The system of units $\hbar = c = 1$ is used).

In [1] the final result is obtained for states connected with the *"reference frame in which the system is in motion with velocity $\vec{v}$ "*. In this new reference frame the momentum of the particle equals $\vec{k}_m$ and $\vec{k}_m \neq \vec{p}$, where $\vec{p}$ is the momentum of the same particle but in the rest frame of the observer. The state of the moving unstable particle is described by a vector $|\Phi_v\rangle$ which should be an element of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_v$ connected with this new reference frame in which the system is in motion but this problem is not explained in [1]. So, in fact, the case considered in [1] is not the same case, which was analyzed in [2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. What is more, in [1] the final result has been obtained for the amplitude (see (21) therein),

$$A_v(t; \vec{x}) = \langle \Phi_v | e^{-itH + i\vec{P} \cdot \vec{x}} | \Phi_v \rangle, \quad (3)$$

where $\vec{x}$ is a coordinate. This is a fact. So, comparing with each other the results reported in [1] and presented in [2, 3, 4, 5, 6] is at least

doubtful. What is more, an interpretation of the amplitude $A_v(t; \vec{x})$ is unclear: The vector $\exp[-itH + i\vec{P} \cdot \vec{x}]|\Phi_v\rangle$ does not solve the evolution equation for the initial condition $|\Phi_v\rangle$.

Searching for the properties of the amplitude $A_v(t; \vec{x})$ authors of [1] (as well as authors of [2, 3, 4, 5, 6] analyzing properties of $A_0(t)$ and $A_p(t)$) use the integral representation of $A_v(t; \vec{x})$ as the Fourier transform of the energy or, equivalently mass distribution function $\omega(m)$ (see, eg. [11, 12, 13, 14]) and obtain that (see (39) in [1])

$$A_v(t; \vec{x}) = \int dm \left[\omega(m) \times \right. \quad (4) \\ \left. \times \int d^3\vec{p} |\phi(\vec{p})|^2 e^{-iE_m(\vec{k}_m)t + i\vec{k}_m \cdot \vec{x}} \right],$$

where $\omega(m) = |\rho(m)|^2$ and $\rho(m)$ are the expansion coefficients of $|\Phi_v\rangle$ in the basis of eigenvectors $|E_m(\vec{k}_m), \vec{k}_m, m\rangle$ for the Hamiltonian H (see (37) in [1]). $\phi(\vec{p})$ is the momentum distribution such that $\int d^3\vec{p} |\phi(\vec{p})|^2 = 1$. The energy $E_m(\vec{k}_m)$ and momentum $\vec{k}_m$ in the new reference frame mentioned are connected with $E_m(\vec{p})$ and $\vec{p}$ in the rest frame by Lorentz transformations (see (33) — (35) in [1]),

$$E_m(\vec{k}_m) = \gamma(E_m(\vec{p}) + v p_{\parallel}), \quad (5)$$

$$k_{m\parallel} = \gamma(p_{\parallel} + v E_m(\vec{p})), \quad (6)$$

$$\vec{k}_{m\perp} = \vec{p}_{\perp}, \quad (7)$$

where $k_{m\parallel}$ ($\vec{k}_{m\perp}$) and $p_{\parallel}$ ($\vec{p}_{\perp}$) are components of $\vec{k}_m$ and $\vec{p}$ parallel (orthogonal) to the velocity $\vec{v}$, and

$$E_m(\vec{p}) = \sqrt{m^2 + \vec{p}^2}. \quad (8)$$

Next, authors of [1] limited their considerations to the case when for the decay width Γ , mass of the particle M and the momentum uncertainty $\sigma_p^2 = \int d^3\vec{p} |\phi(\vec{p})|^2 (p_i)^2$, ($i = 1, 2, 3$), the following condition

$$\Gamma \ll \sigma_p \ll M, \quad (9)$$

is assumed to hold. This is crucial condition which allowed them to approximate the energy $E_m(p)$ as follows

$$E_m(\vec{p}) \simeq m, \quad (10)$$

neglecting terms of order $\vec{p}^2/m^2$. A discussion of the admissibility of the condition (9) uses arguments similar to those one can find, e.g.

in [15]. The difference is that in [15] the approximation $E_p(m) \simeq m + \vec{p}^2/2m$ is used instead of (10).

The condition (9) and its consequence, that is the approximation (10), were used in [1] to replace relations (5), (6) by the following, approximate relations,

$$E_m(\vec{k}_m) \simeq \gamma(m + v p_{\parallel}), \quad (11)$$

$$k_{m\parallel} \simeq \gamma(p_{\parallel} + vm). \quad (12)$$

Finally replacing $E_m(\vec{k}_m)$ and $\vec{k}_m$ under the integral sign in (4) by (11) and (12) respectively (or in [1], in (41) by (33) and (34)) after some algebra authors of [1] obtain the relation (46) that was needed, that is a relation of the following type

$$P_v(t) = P_0(t/\gamma). \quad (13)$$

This result obtained within the condition and approximation described above was the basis of the all conclusions presented in [1].

Unfortunately, in [1] only the admissibility of the assumed conditions and approximations used was discussed without any analysis of their physical consequences. Let us note that assuming (10) and keeping the term $vp_{\parallel} \neq 0$ in (11) is justified only if the contribution of $vp_{\parallel}$ into (11) is not negligible, ie., when $|vp_{\parallel}| > 0$ significantly: It is because within the system of units used v is dimensionless quantity such that $0 \leq v < 1$ and thus always $|vp_{\parallel}| < |p_{\parallel}|$. This means that in fact the contribution of $vp_{\parallel}$ is not negligible if $|p_{\parallel}| > 0$ (and thus $|\vec{p}| > 0$) significantly. In such a case the use of the identity

$$\gamma \equiv \frac{E_m(\vec{p})}{m} = \frac{\sqrt{m^2 + \vec{p}^2}}{m}. \quad (14)$$

to find that in the case of (10) the conclusion

$$\gamma \equiv \frac{E_m(\vec{p})}{m} \simeq 1, \quad (15)$$

seems to be justified and it will be reasonable as long as the nonzero term $vp_{\parallel}$ will be used in (11).

The similar analysis performed within the use of the identity (14) shows that the approximation used in [15] leads to the conclusion that the results obtained therein are valid for $\gamma \simeq 1 + \vec{p}^2/2m^2 < 2$, that is for $1 < \gamma < 2$, and for no more than a few lifetimes.

We should remember that $E_m(\vec{p})$ and $\vec{p}$ used in (5), (6) and (11), (12) can not be considered as they would be completely independent quantities. (In fact, it was done in [1] using the approximations (11), (12)). The supposition, that the contribution of $vp_{\parallel}$ into (11) can not be neglected, contradicts the approximation used to obtain the result (10) which is crucial for the main conclusions of [1]. Simply

$$E_m(\vec{p}) = \sqrt{m^2 + \vec{p}^2} \simeq m \Leftrightarrow |\vec{p}| \simeq 0, \quad (16)$$

or, more exactly,

$$E_m(\vec{p}) = \sqrt{m^2 + \vec{p}^2} \simeq m \Leftrightarrow |\vec{p}_{\perp}| \simeq 0 \text{ and } p_{\parallel} \simeq 0. \quad (17)$$

The properties $|v| < 1$ and (17) mean that in fact the contribution of $vp_{\parallel}$ into (11) is negligible small. So keeping the same level of accuracy for the approximation leading to the relation (10) for $E_m(\vec{p})$ as well as for that one for $p_{\parallel}$, which is required by conditions of consistency of calculations, one has to approximate $E_m(\vec{k}_m)$ and $k_{\parallel}$ given by (5), (6) as

$$E_m(\vec{k}_m) \simeq \gamma m, \quad (18)$$

$$k_{m\parallel} \simeq \gamma v m, \quad (19)$$

because within the approximation used in order to obtain (10) the elements $p_{\parallel}$ and $vp_{\parallel}$ are negligible small.

Note that the identity (14) always holds when one considers Lorentz transformations of the energy $E(\vec{p})$ and momentum $\vec{p}$ forming 4-vector $(E(\vec{p}), \vec{p})$ in Minkowski space and $m > 0$. The same identity has to hold for $E_m(\vec{k}_m)$: There is

$$\gamma \equiv \frac{E_m(\vec{k}_m)}{m}. \quad (20)$$

Using this identity and the approximation (11), which was used in [1] as the basis of calculations performed therein, we obtain the following consistency condition

$$\gamma \equiv \frac{E_m(\vec{k}_m)}{m} \simeq \frac{\gamma(m + v p_{\parallel})}{m}. \quad (21)$$

The only solution of this equation is

$$v p_{\parallel} \simeq 0, \quad (22)$$

from which it follows that, or $v \simeq 0$ and $p_{\parallel}$ is not too large, or $v \simeq 0$ and $p_{\parallel} \simeq 0$ both. There is $\gamma \simeq 1$ in these cases both. The third possibility is that $p_{\parallel} \simeq 0$ and $0 < v < 1$. This last case leads to some inconsistencies. Namely, in any case the result (22) means that the relation (11), (or (33) in [1]), can not be considered as a correct approximations. In the light of this discussion only the relations (18) and (19) are correct and self-consistent. Thus

$$E_m(\vec{k}_m) - E_{m'}(\vec{k}'_{m'}) \simeq \gamma(m - m'), \quad (23)$$

and only such approximations (that is (18), (19) and (23)) should be used when performing integrations in the integral (41) in [1] instead of (11) (or (33) in [1]). Unfortunately, this, contrary to the result (46) in [1], leads to the result, $P_v(t) = P_0(\gamma t)$, that is to the result (20) in [1], which was not observed in any experiment.

The use of (9) and (10) in [1] is the indisputable fact and it was crucial. If to limit the analysis of results presented in [1] to the consequences of the relation (15) being the consequence of (9) and (10) one may conclude that, in fact, the relation (46) in [1] (or (13) in this letter), can be realized only in the case of non moving particles, $\gamma \cong 1$, and it is approximately valid only for such particles. This means that the main result (46) of [1], which looks nice, holds only in the trivial situation when the particle considered is not moving (or is moving very slowly with an extremely non-relativistic velocity). On the other hand, it can be seen that the use of absolutely all implications of (9) and (10) without missing (22) (and thus (18), (23)), which is necessary to fulfill the consistency conditions, shows that the result (46) in [1] holds for $v \simeq 0$ and it is wrong for such v that $0 < v < 1$: The correct approximation (18) gives the relation (23) and leads to the result which was never met in experiments and which is different from (46) in [1]. So, in the light of the results (15) and (22) — (23) criticism of the results obtained in [2, 3, 4, 5, 6], which are valid for any $\gamma > 1$, and conclusions presented in [1] are completely unfounded. Nevertheless, paradoxically, the publication [1] is very important, because in fact it confirms the observations and conclusions drawn in [2, 3, 4, 5, 6] that in the case of moving particles the classical dilation relation of the form (13) can be obtained within the rigorous quantum mechanical treatment of the problem (without using assumptions of the type (10)) only as the approximate relation but not as the exact relation.

Acknowledgments: The work was supported by the Polish NCN grant No DEC-2013/09/B/ST2/03455.

References

- [1] Alavi S. A.Giunti C., Europhysics Letters **109** (2015) 60001; arXiv: 1412.3346 [quant-ph].
- [2] Stefanovich E. V., International Journal of Theoretical Physics, **35** (1996) 2539.
- [3] Stefanovich E. V., *Relativistic quantum dynamics*, arXiv: physics/0504062.
- [4] Stefanovich E. V., *Violations of Eistein's time dilation formula in particle decays*, arXiv: physics/0603043.
- [5] Shirokov M., International Journal of Theoretical Physics, **43** (2004) 1541.
- [6] Urbanowski K., Physics Letters B, **737** (2014)346.
- [7] Frisch D. H., Smith J. H. *et al.*, American Journal of Physics, **31** (1963) 342.
- [8] Bailye J., Borer K. *et al.*, Nature, **268** (1977) 301.
- [9] Shirokov M., Concepts of Physics, **3** (2006) 193.
- [10] Shirokov M., Physics of Particle and Nuclei Letters, **6** (2009) 14.
- [11] Krylov N. S. and Fock V. A., Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. (JETP), **17** (1947) 93.
- [12] Khalfin L. A., Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz., **33** (1957) 1371.
- [13] Fonda L., Ghirardii G. C. and Rimini A., Reports on Progres in Physics, **41** (1978) 587.
- [14] Martorell J., Muga G. J. and Sprung D. W. L., *Quantum Post-exponential Decay*, (Lectures Notes in Physics), **789** (2009) 239 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg — 2009).
- [15] Exner P., Physical Review D, **28** (1983) 2621.